REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-15 are pending upon entry of this amendment, all of which have been amended. Claims 2, 7 and 12 have been cancelled. No new matter has been presented.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murahashi, U.S. Patent No. 5,864,652. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "said judging unit being configured to judge said compression process execution condition as being satisfied when said processor does not execute any of a plurality of predetermined processes or executed a predetermined combination of one or more processes selected from said plurality of predetermined processes, said plurality of predetermined processes comprising spooling image data, rasterizing spooled image data, printing, compressing image data, and expanding image data." This feature is not taught or suggested by Murahashi.

The Examiner asserts that Murahashi teaches the claimed judging unit, because in Murahashi, CPU1 initializes compression/expansion if CPU2 determines that it has received sufficient print instruction data to initiate the start of printing. Specifically, to reject claim 1, the Examiner compares the claimed "compression process execution condition" with Murahashi's teaching of receipt of sufficient print instruction data by CPU2. However, Murahashi's teaching does not correspond to the claimed "when said processor does not execute any of a plurality of predetermined processes or executed a predetermined combination of one or more processes selected from said plurality of predetermined processes." Specifically, the condition for initiating the compression/expansion in Murahashi is satisfied depending on whether the processor (CPU2) *receives* sufficient print instruction data, whereas in the claimed invention, such condition is satisfied depending on what processes from a plurality of *predetermined processes*, if any, the processor *executed*. Since Murahashi's condition for initiating the compression/expansion has nothing to do with what either CPU1 or CPU2 processes. Thus, Murahashi fails to teach this feature.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 6 and 11 recites similar features as claim 1 and are similarly allowable. Claims 3-5, 8-10 and 13-15 are allowable for their respective dependencies on an allowable claim.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **325772034000**.

Dated: December 31, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Amir R. Rohani
    Registration No.: 61,782
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7757